

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 19-20, 22, 24-25 and 29-31 have been amended.

Formal Matters

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's diligent review of the Specification. However, with regard to the Summary of the Invention, Applicants wish the Specification to remain unchanged in this regard. Applicants respectfully submit that no requirement exists that a Summary of the Invention section be provided. (*See*, 37 CFR 1.37; MPEP 608.01(d) ("...", when set forth,"))

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 6 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended these claims to address the Examiner's concerns, and so respectfully submit that this rejection is now therefore moot. Support for these amendments can be found at least on p. 21 of the Specification.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended this claim to address the Examiner's concerns, and so respectfully submit that this rejection is now therefore moot. Support for this amendment can be found at least on p. 21 of the Specification.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended this claim to address the Examiner's concerns. The limitation in question now reads "... zero or more occurrences of the command element" Applicants respectfully note that the amended limitation differs from the interpretation given this limitation in the Office Action (that of "the argument elements" (Office Action, p. 3, para. 7)). Applicants therefore respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 25, 26, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by London, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,831,609 (London). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bookman, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,673 (Bookman). In light of the amendments made to independent claims 1, 8 and 25, and the fact that such limitations are not taught by London or Bookman, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 4, 7, 9, 11-19, 27, 28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over London, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,831,609 (London).

While not conceding that the cited reference qualifies as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that

the cited reference, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 11, 20 and 24-25 to include various limitations, and so respectfully submits that among these limitations, London fails to show, teach or even suggest the use of a command that is a predefined query. For example, claim 1 now reads:

1. A method comprising:
providing information relating to a business application in a server system, comprising receiving a request, wherein
 - the request is configured to cause the business application to execute a command of the business application,
 - the request comprises an indication of a user interface element to be returned, and
 - the command is a predefined query;executing the command of the business application to generate a data element;
generating the user interface element to be returned in response to the request; and
sending a response comprising the user interface element and the data element.

Amended independent claims 8, 11, 20 and 24-25, as noted, include comparable limitations, among other limitations of the respective claims.

The Office Action correctly notes that London fails to teach the claimed use of a command that is a predefined query. However, the Office Action cites London's discussion of

“MICROSOFT EXCEL” at col. 2, line 62, as somehow showing, teaching or suggesting this limitation. The Office Action states that:

“One of skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that ‘MICROSOFT EXCEL’ is a common **database** program allowing for search queries”

(Office Action, p. 8; Emphasis supplied)

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully note that “MICROSOFT EXCEL” is, in fact, not a database program, but a spreadsheet program. Thus, Applicants are unaware of any capability of “MICROSOFT EXCEL” to act as a database, and in so doing, support queries of any type, let alone the claimed use of a command that is a predefined query. This, in and of itself, serves to sufficiently distinguish the claimed invention from London.

Claims 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,673 (Bookman).

While not conceding that the cited reference qualifies as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited reference, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

As an initial matter, claims 21-23 are allowable for at least the reasons provided with regard to claim 20 above.

With regard to claim 24, Applicants have amended claim 24 to read as follows:

24. A computer-readable medium containing a data structure defining an outbound response sent by a web server, the data structure comprising:

- an application element having a name attribute;
- a navigation element nested within the application element, having a name attribute, and having sub-elements from a set comprising a menu element, tool bar element, screen bar element, thread bar element, view bar element, and page item element;
- a predefined query bar element nested within the application element and each having a name attribute; and
- one or more elements from the set of elements comprising a screen element, an applet element, and a form element, the one or more elements being nested within the application element and each having a name attribute.

Insofar as Applicants are able to discern, Bookman fails to show, teach or even suggest the use of a command that is a predefined query, among other of the claim limitations Bookman fails to show, teach or suggest. Correctly, then, the Office Action fails to cite Bookman for the proposition that the use of a command that is a predefined query is shown, taught or suggested therein. The Office Action further fails to discuss or demonstrate a manner in which Bookman might be combined with any other reference (be it London or another reference or references), and/or skill in the art. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 24 is not obvious in light of Bookman.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 1, 8, 11, 20 and 24-25, and all claims dependent upon them, and that they are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections to those claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5084.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 6, 2007.




Attorney for Applicants

8/6/07

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Samuel G. Campbell, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099